1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	LISTENING SESSION
7	Proposed Regulations for State Courts and Agencies
8	in Indian Child Custody Proceedings
9	"ICWA Proposed Rule" (25 CFR 23)
10	000
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	Grand Sierra Resort
16	Reno, Nevada
17	April 28, 2015
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	REPORTED BY: KRISTINE BOKELMANN CSR #165, CRR, RDR
25	

1	APPEARANCES OF PANEL:
2	
3	ANN MARIE BLEDSOE DOWNES
4	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Economic Development
5	rorrey and Economic Development
6	RODINA CAVE Senior Advisor to Assistant Secretary - IA
7	Senior Advisor to Assistant Secretary - IA
8	SARAH WALTERS
9	Counselor to the Assistant Secretary
10	GINA JACKSON
11	Senior Fellow, IPA, Indian Child Welfare
12	
13	
1 4	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

1 INDEX 2 SPEAKER: PAGE: 19 3 GLORIA SIMEON Orutsararmuit Native Council 4 5 VICTOR JOSEPH 20 President of Tanana Chiefs Conference 6 7 22 SUSAN WELLS Kenaitz Tribal Court Judge 8 9 DAVID HARRISON 24 Private Citizen, Chickaloon 10 11 ONA WHITEWING GARVIN 24 Ho-Chunk Indian Tribe 12 13 BEN NUVAMSA 26 President of KIVA Institute 14 15 27 MARY ANN MILLS Kenaitz Tribal Court Judge 16 17 ELIZABETH SAAGULIK HENSLEY 30 Maniilaq Association 18 JULIE ROBERTS-HYSLOP 31 19 Vice President for Tanana Chiefs Conference 20 21 WILL MICKLIN 32 First Vice President of Central Council United 22 Tribes of Arkansas 23 24 KEN SELBY Community Service Director, Aleutian Pribilof 35 25 Islands Association

1 INDEX 2 SPEAKER: PAGE: 3 ANTONIO MONDRAGON 37 Taos Pueblo 4 5 LIISIA BLIZZARD 39 Kenai, Alaska, Kenaitz Council Member 6 7 SHAWN DURAN 41 Taos Pueblo, Tribal Administrator 8 9 GRETA EDSON 42 Ketchikan Tribal Community 10 11 MARCH RUNNER 46 Tribal Administrator Director, Galena Village, 12 Alaska TOM UKALLAYSAAO 48 13 Executive Director of Kotzebue 14 15 GEORGE THURMAN 51 Principal Chief of Sac and Fox Nation 16 17 RICHARD JACKSON 53 Ketchikan Native Community 18 19 FRANK THOMPSON 54 First Chief of Evansville Tribal Council of 20 Alaska 21 WILL MAYO 54 Tribal Citizen of Tanana Village 22 23 24 25

(Listening Session already in progress.)

MS. DOWNES: I wanted to also acknowledge -- I didn't do this in the first part of my introductions, but the other federal officials in the room have been instrumental in this work. Specifically I know that Gena Tyner-Dawson is here from DOJ. Gina? Who has been really critical in this work, and I'd like to thank her for joining us and being with us today.

I saw Dr. Robidioux earlier. She's been very helpful when we're organizing some of this work under the White House Council on Native American Affairs under the health sub-group. I don't know if Dr. Robidioux is still in the room, but thank you for being here.

And I know we have other officials from within the bureau and other agencies in the federal government, and thank you all for being here.

So with that, I will go ahead and sort of dive into the substance of the presentation and get started with what we're doing.

So as many of you know, we issued updated guidelines very recently, and it was through that work that we realized and recognized that we needed to take additional steps, and hence, the proposed rule.

When Congress enacted ICWA, it had the best of intentions. It was to protect kids from forced removal

from their community and to protect tribes from losing their children. But as we've seen over the past 35 years, and most notably in the CHECKCHECK Veronica case, ICWA hasn't always lived up to its potential, but, you know, obviously we can do better and state court proceedings and with agency actions and we want to, through this rule, to address some of that.

1.3

So prior to enactment of ICWA there were guidelines and regulations issued, but they were not strong enough to create a consistent application of the law. And through the course of the listening sessions — I think we held a total of five on the guidelines — we learned about some of those inconsistencies and some of the struggles out there with ICWA, and so the regulations are an attempt to try to improve on that [indiscernible] and provide additional guidance.

We have not updated the regulations since right after ICWA was enacted, and in fact, those regulations were less of a substantive type guidance to ICWA, and so we're hoping that these indeed do do that. And so now we are here today in trying to implement that process and issue these regulations, and your input and advice on that is critical.

This is one of a series of listening sessions

and consultations we'll be doing. We did put this listening session on the agenda after [inaudible] took these added to this session in Reno and we were happy to do that.

2.1

We were pleased to hear about the interest and the desire to have this. I'd like to thank all of you for being here. Obviously I know it's a commitment of resources and time away from your local communities to travel not only to these conferences but to participate in sessions like this, so I would really like to thank you for that.

We're in a critical stage of the process, and as I said, May 19th is the date for closing of the comments, so this session is timely, I think.

So what we're going to try to do, my colleagues are going to help me have walk through the regulations in a more detailed manner, but essentially we're going to share with you what the rule -- regulation is attempting to do. We have some updated definitions. We have definitions to other items.

I'm not good with PowerPoint.

So for example, active efforts, custody, voluntary placement, just by way of example. These are items that came up in our listening sessions on the guidelines that we realize we needed to further address

1 through regulation, and so that's some of what we're 2 trying to do here. 3 The goal essentially, like I said earlier, is 4 to try and get consistent application of ICWA in all 5 states. As we know, it is applied differently in 6 different states. Some are much stronger in their 7 application and adherence to ICWA and others perhaps not 8 so much. So we're hoping that the regulations will 9 address some of that inconsistency in getting a 10 comprehensive and clear guidance for the application of 11 the ICWA. 12 Actually, I think that closes out my portion. 13 I'm going to go ahead and turn to Rodina who is going to 14 cover the next few portions of the slide. And again, if 15 you haven't received the materials, raise your hand. 16 We'll get some out to you. If not, they are in the back 17 of the room, so that you can follow along with this 18 portion of the public presentation. 19 MS. CAVE: Thank you. I guess there's someone 20 over here on this side of the room that needs some 2.1 materials. 2.2 MS. DOWNES: And in the center. 23 MS. CAVE: And in the center, so if someone 24 could run some --

Keep your hand up.

MS. DOWNES:

25

MS. CAVE: Yeah, keep your hands up. Thanks.

I'm Rodina Cave. I am the senior policy advisor to the assistant secretary and I'll be talking about the pretrial requirements that are included in the proposed rule.

1.3

2.2

And so the proposed rule includes a requirement that agencies and state courts must ask whether the child is an Indian child. So they need to ask if there's reason to believe that the child is an Indian child, and the proposed rule includes some examples of when an agency has reason to believe that a child is an Indian child.

And also the proposed rule includes a requirement regarding for voluntary proceedings that if the consenting parent wants anonymity, then the agency or court must keep the relevant documents under seal but still provide notice to the tribes.

And also the proposed rule includes a requirement to engage in active efforts, and so one of the things that we heard a lot about in the listening sessions is, you know, when does that start. When do active efforts -- when does that requirement start.

And so the proposed rule states that it starts as soon as the case or investigation may result in placement of an Indian child outside the custody of a

1.3

parent or the Indian custodian. And it also -- active efforts are also required when investigating whether the child is an Indian child.

The proposed rule also includes the requirement that only the tribe may determine whether the child is a member of that tribe or eligible for membership.

The proposed rule also sets out the steps if the child is potentially a member of more than one tribe and other -- there's other processes for designating a tribe -- or sorry, after the designation of the tribe, how does notice happen. And also that a state court must dismiss the action as soon as it determines that it lacks jurisdiction, for instance, if a tribal court has jurisdiction.

The proposed rule includes provisions regarding when notice is required and how the notice should be provided, Registered Mail with return receipt requested.

And also the proposed rule includes provisions for time limits, that no substantive proceedings, rulings or decisions on a child's placement or termination of parental rights may occur until notice and the waiting periods have elapsed, and it also includes the waiting periods. So, you know, a

proceeding may not begin until 10 days after the parent or Indian custodian and tribe receives notice, and that the tribe or Indian custodian or parent can request an additional 20 days.

Regarding emergency removal, the proposed rule sets out that emergency removal must be as short as possible and that the state court or agency must document whether removal or placement is proper and continues to be necessary to prevent imminent physical damage or harm to the child, and, you know, that the court has to hold a hearing to evaluate whether the emergency removal continued placement is necessary and immediately terminate it when the emergency has ended.

And continuing with emergency removal, the agency must treat the child as an Indian child until a contrary determination has been made and conduct active efforts to prevent the breakup of the Indian family as early as possible before removal is possible.

And also, you know, again, notification and that the agency must maintain records of when notice was provided.

And also on emergency removal, the proposed rule provides that at any court hearing or emergency removal placement, the court must decide if removal or placement is no longer necessary to prevent imminent

physical damage or harm. And that every emergency custody should be less than 30 days unless there's a hearing or testimony of a qualified expert witness or extraordinary circumstances exist.

And now I will turn it over to Sarah Walters who will be talking about transfers to the tribal court.

NS, JACKSON:

MS. WALTERS: Good afternoon. I'm Sarah
Walters. I'm Counselor to the Assistant Secretary for
Indian Affairs and a member of the Cheyenne River Sioux
Tribe.

Thank you so much for being here with us today. I'm going to talk a little bit about transfers to tribal court. ICWA requires that tribal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over cases -- Indian child welfare cases for kids that reside on Indian reservations.

States can have jurisdiction over cases where Indian children reside off Indian reservations.

However, any party at any time has the right during the -- at any time during the proceeding to request transfer to a tribal court, which is very important.

And courts have to transfer to tribal courts except in very limited circumstances such as that either parent objects to the transfer; that that tribal court

declines the transfer, which does happen at times; or state court -- a state court determines that there's good cause.

2.0

Now, this is -- we heard during our listening sessions that the good cause determination is by far the most implemented by state courts to prevent the transfer of those cases to tribal courts. So the transfer and the request is really important.

Oh, sorry. I wasn't even on that slide. I apologize. I'm new at this, too.

So now, during the petition for the placement or termination of parental rights, there are specific requirements for that petition as well, which is -- one of which is that active efforts to avoid the need to remove the child were conducted by the removing agency and starting at the commencement of the proceeding.

Active efforts in the guidelines and in the proposed rule constitute more than the reasonable efforts that are required in all child welfare cases.

The active efforts have to be documented.

They also have to show what active efforts were used and they have to use resources like the child's extended family, as well as tribal members, to keep the Indian family intact. That's what the active efforts are geared towards, is keeping the family intact if

possible.

2.1

So there's also requirements for when the court can decide when a foster or adopted placement is necessary. There's a standard of proof, clear and convincing evidence, and the court can order the termination of parental rights only when there's evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that that's the necessary thing to do.

ICWA also requires that there be testimony by a qualified expert witness during the child custody proceeding, and the guidelines in the proposed rule discuss the requirements for those qualified expert witnesses, that they can't just be experts in child welfare generally. They have to have knowledge of the child's tribe, tribal culture and community so that the court can determine what the parameters of that relationship are and what is considered appropriate behavior.

Next I am going to turn it over to our senior fellow, Gina Jackson, and she's going to finish up for us.

NS, JACKSON: Hello, everyone. Great to see you all here today, and we're excited to hear from you today. I'm going to talk about voluntary proceedings, disposition, and post-trial rights, and I'm going to hit

a few highlights from the proposed rule and just so we can save time for all of you to speak.

So for the proposed rule, in any voluntary proceeding, the agency and state court must ask. So it's not just the agency and the court relying on the agency and it's not just the court. It's the state and the agency and the court, both must ask whether the child is an Indian child, providing the tribe with notice, including the right to intervene.

In dispositions, the agency must file -follow the ICWA preferences, placement preferences or
the tribal placement preferences. And if there is a
request for anonymity, they still must be followed.

There must be clear and convincing evidence that diligent search was made to meet the preferences, and explain if it couldn't be met, noticing parents, Indian custodians, family members, the tribe, and maintain documentation of placements.

Departure from the placement preferences can be made only if a court finds good cause. And the good cause basis must be included in the court record. And the party asserting good cause, they have the burden to prove good cause by the standard of clear and convincing evidence.

In dispositions, good cause to depart from the

placement preferences must be based on the parents'
request, if both attest they have reviewed the placement
options; the child's request, if they are able to
understand the decision; the child's extraordinary
physical or emotional needs as established by a
qualified expert witness. And what it does not include
is bonding and attachment from the placement.

1.3

Good cause may not be based on socioeconomic status of any placement relative to another placement.

In post-trial rights, the proposed rule establishes procedures to vacate an adoption if consent was obtained by fraud or duress, or if the proceedings violated ICWA.

The proposed rule establishes who can invalidate an action based on a violation of ICWA, which it is the Indian child, the parent, the Indian custodian, the tribe, regardless of whether that particular party's rights were violated.

The rule establishes adult adoptees' rights to learn their tribal affiliation; encourages states to designate someone to assist with adult adoptees. It also requires notice of any change in the child's status such as change of placement.

Other post-trial rights. States must establish a single location for all records of

2.0

voluntary, involuntary foster care, pre-adoption placements, adoptive placements that will be available within seven days of request by the Indian tribe or by a child's tribe or the Department of Interior.

And the records must contain, at a minimum, the petition or complaint, substantive orders in the proceedings, and record of placement determination, including the findings in the court record and the social worker's statement.

One of the most important things that we're looking at is hearing from you, and you may comment on any provision of the proposed rule, not just here today but also in writing. We also will have other opportunities through tribal consultation sessions and public meetings.

We're looking at upcoming meetings next week in Albuquerque; Prior Lake, Minnesota. We'll have a national teleconference. And then the week after will be in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

The important date to remember is May 19th, that we're accepting comments on the proposed rule any time until May 19th. Email is the preferred method.

And even today if you give verbal comments, submitting comments in writing as well would be greatly appreciated and we look forward to hearing from you.

1.3

MS. DOWNES: So that concludes our presentation to sort of start off the session, and I hope that gives you an overview of what the rule is about and sort of what's going on. Many of you work with this on a day-to-day basis and we're really anxious to hear from you.

We did start our session a little late, and so I think we're okay kind of spilling over past the 4:00 o'clock hour in this room. So we'll set a target and time for around 10 after, maybe quarter after. Let's say quarter after 4:00 in the hopes that we can get everybody's comments in.

I will reiterate that we would like you to state your name and spell your name for the record so that the court reporter has a clear identification for purposes of the record. If you have a business card and you'd like to share that with her, I would encourage you to do that as well.

And that we would like to hear from tribal leadership in the room first, if at all possible. And please limit your comments to around five minutes.

So this is really our chance to hear from you.

If there are points that need clarification, what are those points. If you have suggestions for that, we would really like to hear that.

1.3

So with that, we have two mics up at the front of the room. You can start a queue. I don't want anybody standing too long, but we want to make sure that we get everybody in.

So I will go ahead and open up the floor for comments. And again, remember your name and spelling. And we will go ahead and get started with the listening portion of our session and I'll turn first to this lady here.

MS. SIMEON: Thank you. Gloria Simeon, S-I-M-E-O-N, Orutsararmiut Native Council, O-R-U-T-S-A-R-A-R-M-I-U-T, representing the native [inaudible] of Alaska.

I brought this up before when we discussed family law as it pertains to tribes and native people, and these are all well and good. Where the disconnect is is where the state is mandated to apply these laws in all of their [indiscernible] with native people.

So if there's any way that we can enforce the ICWA, especially with the states, we are looking to a better day in Alaska with the new governor and lieutenant governor, for the people to be more kind to tribes.

But that's for Alaska. Other states have the same issues and they need -- and states need to know

that these are not suggestions. These are mandated by federal law to protect our children. Thank you.

2.1

MS. DOWNES: Thank you so much. And yes, there are some exciting developments in some states, and I know Alaska is one of them, so I appreciate that.

Over here.

MR. JOSEPH: Thank you. Victor Joseph,

V-I-C-T-O-R, J-O-S-E-P-H, President of Tanana Chiefs

Conference, Interior of Alaska.

First of all, I wanted to thank you for putting on this listening session in such a quick order. I know that the request just came in a few days ago. So you all doing this is really greatly appreciated. It gives us an opportunity to join into these.

First off, I have a clarification and a couple points that I want to make. First of all, if you can clarify May 19th. I know we're going to have our information in before May 19th, but is that the end of business day Eastern Time or the end of the day 11:59? It's just a question I have for clarification for others.

The other, we really support the regulations, and it was some good work, and I just wanted to thank you. But we also strongly encourage you to move through this process timely. We don't want to be giving states,

our state agencies the discretion to deny or transfer jurisdictions to tribal courts or prevent continued deviation from ICWA placement criteria, so the faster we can move through this.

I've seen these proposed rules stay in process for a while, and I really think it would be good if we can move very quickly, especially since we know that the administration's going to change shortly.

That also being said, we also recommend that the authority of BIA to meet to regulate that include the final published rule. It is also recommended that the individual regulations be justified with references to cases, state regulations, and legislative history.

It's important that we look at this as exactly what the Assistant Secretary, Ken Washburn, talked about yesterday. We're seeing authorities of the executive body being challenged more and more, so it's important that you keep up to this.

But it's also very important, because we've been waiting for this for years, and we want to make sure that these regulations stand up to any challenge that's going to be laid forward. So I want to thank you for your work in advance and for what you've done, and Onamasay [phonetic].

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. Real quickly, I would

1 like to respond to the question about the May 19th. 2 I turn to one of my colleagues to -- what's the --MS. WALTERS: So it's going to be midnight 3 4 Eastern Time on May 19th, so just keep that in mind. 5 We'll keep it open until midnight EDC. Thanks. MS. WELLS: Thank you. I'm Susan Wells. 6 I'm 7 a Kenaitz Tribe -- Kenaitz Nation citizen in Kenai, Alaska. I'm a tribal council member and also a tribal 8 9 court judge. 10 My concern with this language -- or not -- I 11 think we need to add something in here. We have that the state court must dismiss an action as soon as it 12 13 determines it lacks jurisdiction. It doesn't say that 14 if I have a Tanana child living in my city or in the 15 outlying areas, it's in the tribal -- I mean, in the 16 state court that I can intervene. 17 Where our children get lost in the shuffle and 18 through the cracks is that the language says that they 19 are a member or eligible for membership in a tribe. 20 necessarily my tribe. 21 And so I'd like to be able to help protect all of the children in Alaska, whether they're from up 22 23 north, Barrow; west, [indiscernible] on chain on the 24 Pribilof. If they're in my area, they're in my

They're native children.

25

jurisdiction.

How that works in Kenaitz Court is if we intervene with the child -- and we've done this because they're natives and they're our children, they're our cousins, I'll say -- what we do is we intervene, and then we go above and beyond to find out where that child's from, who -- what tribe they belong to or what tribes they belong to, and then we will contact that tribe and get a resolution.

We may ask them to sit concurrent with us or we may transfer the case to them or whatever we can so that we do not get this child lost in the state system.

The state is not friendly to our children. We can take care of our children. And we always take -- go above and beyond to make sure that the child -- that we work in the best interests of the child.

We always want to reunify. If we can't reunify them with their parents, then we find a family member. And they're always connected to our tribe.

So thank you. I'd really like to have that clarified in the law -- or in the regulation.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. I'm going to take just a moment. Are we hearing everything okay for the record?

THE REPORTER: Most of it.

MS. DOWNES: Most of it? I know. I think

part of it is sort of the sound gap up here, too. So if you can speak loud and clear and make sure we get it on the record, that would be great.

I'll turn first to you next.

1.3

MR. HARRISON: My name is David Harrison, private citizen Chickaloon Village. And just a recommendation for the agency. When they have public comment periods and public meetings, more often than not the federal government forgets that there's almost half of the federally recognized tribes in Alaska, and the economic conditions prohibit many of us from traveling to the Lower 48 to attend these types of hearings, these listening sessions.

Granted, there's a number of us here, but there's a lot more at home that probably would like to have some say publicly about issues that affect their lives, and this is one that greatly affects our future generations. But we would just like to make the recommendation that don't forget to come to Alaska with your public hearings and comments and those things. Thank you.

MS. GARVIN: Good afternoon. My name is Ona Whitewing Garvin, O N A, W-H-I-T-E-W-I-N-G, last name Garvin, G-A-R-V-I-N. I am executive director of health for the Ho-Chunk Nation.

In 2005 and 2009 the Ho-Chunk Nation

Legislature was asked to bring an issue before the state of Wisconsin because our children were being lost. They were being kidnapped. They were being taken away, and we lost sight of them.

1978 law didn't do anything for our people in Wisconsin. So the legislature, along with the other 10 tribes in the state of Wisconsin, got together and they formed a coalition to go in and lobby with the state of Wisconsin legislators.

So in 2009 the ICWA codification took place in the state of Wisconsin and was passed into law, and all social workers, judges, and so forth have to abide by it.

And there was also a great big training effort that had to occur. There was a lot of money the tribe spent, and there was underfunded for our Indian Child Welfare purposes at this point. So I applaud the BIA finally doing this, since 1978.

And many of the points that you have gone through in your presentations are the exact ones that are codified into law in the state of Wisconsin. But please consider what we did and we'd like to -- I'll take this back to our tribal legislature and we will be submitting a formal comment before May 19th.

Thank you very much.

2.2

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. And we're anxious to hear, based on your experience, some of the things that work well. Thank you so much.

MR. NUVAMSA: Thank you. My name is Ben Nuvamsa, N-U-V-A-M-S-A. I am president and CEO of Kiva Institute, former chairman of the Hopi Tribe.

I do have a recommendation, although this is not specific to the proposed regulations, but again, to emphasize the lady from Alaska, her comments about the state-run child welfare programs.

There are the amendments to the Social Security Act, Titles IV(e) and IV(b), that are managed by the states. The money comes from HHS to the states for Indian child foster care programs and such.

And what I have to recommend to you and the people here is that efforts should be made to allow for the transition from -- of the funds from the states to tribal governments so that when this happens, maybe the tribes would be able to secure the funds and provide for more holistic programs, because that's what I believe the idea is.

And that's where most of the problems also lie is because of the state-run programs. We have placement problems. We have foster care problems. But if the

2.0

2.1

funds were -- could be transferred directly from HHS to the tribes, and I suggest under the statutory authority of the Public Law 93 638, because it would be consistent with the language in 638, which says services providing for Indians, because of their status as Indians.

But that would allow tribes to contract these programs under Title I and compact them under Title either IV or V.

And so I believe that in this way it would lead towards addressing all these problems that we have with state-run programs. It would move these programs away from a discretionary nature into more of an entitlement program and make these programs more permanent and would bring in all the other benefits that we see that are afforded tribes under Public Law 93 638.

And I think that it may be a different effort, but I think it's something that can be done by both

Interior and HHS so that tribes will be able to at least control their child welfare programs.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you.

MS. MILLS: My name is Mary Ann Mills,
M-A-R-Y, A-N-N, M-I-L-L-S, and I am a council member for
the Kenaitz Indian Tribe and also a Tribal Court judge
in Kenai, Alaska.

1.3

And on your proposed rule, transfer to tribal court, the state court must transfer unless either parents object. This could be very problematic in Alaska because of the severe colonization that has occurred in Alaska, and in many cases our children are native and non-native. And this proposed rule gives more preference to the state than it does to the tribes, and it's very unfair.

Another thing I have question on is qualified expert witness. Who decides what is -- what is a qualified expert witness and -- or -- and also a good cause and is it appropriate to the culture of the tribes. That to me is also very important.

Also, I agree with the last speaker with regard to funding going to tribes. Oftentimes when our tribal court orders parents or grandparents or aunts and uncles, their native child, there's no money that goes with it, and that's because the state has all of the money going to the state, and so that also is a deficit for the tribes, because when we give jurisdiction or custody to a grandparent, there's no money for them.

Also Indian Country is not appropriate for Alaska because there are no reservations. Although we know the title to Alaska is still with the indigenous people, it is -- we're having a tough time with the

government dealing with that issue.

1.3

And so what I would like to see for Alaska is instead of Indian Country, to use jurisdiction of the tribe to extend to our traditional territories.

And these things, you know, I will be writing to the BIA for better wording and explanation, but these are the things that we see.

And also in Alaska, many of the tribes are decreasing in number because there is no economics for them. So we do get a lot of children moving into our area. Even though it isn't a huge area, it has more opportunity for employment.

And like Judge Wells said, we take all Alaska native children in our jurisdiction because we don't want them slipping through the cracks, and that has been the history in Alaska.

We do notify the tribes and we do get their resolution or a letter of consent. We also invite them to be parties to the case. So number one, you know, these are their children, and then they have knowledge for the whole process.

And also because of the lack of funding that we've had for educating tribal judges, it's a way for us to teach other tribes or tribal courts on different processes, and we're working all together in trying to

improve keeping our children within our native communities.

1.3

2.0

2.1

And in Alaska, we have lost so many children. Since the 1980s, we have had calls from native people from all around America asking if they are members of our tribe. And so we know that because of the adoption rate was so great. Removing children from their tribes in Alaska to America has been absolutely devastating to us.

And I would like to thank all of you for your presentation and for taking our testimony. Thank you very much.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. And we look forward to your written comments. And again, with all of these items, if you don't currently have suggestions for how some of these things that are unclear can be improved, please do include that in your written comments as well. We're really looking forward to hearing how we can make things clearer.

I'll turn next to you.

MS. HENSLEY: Elizabeth Saagulik Hensley.

Saagulik, S-A-A-G-U-L-I-K. Hensley, H-E-N-S-L-E-Y. I'm here with Maniilaq Association. We represent 12 tribes in Northwest Alaska.

We thank you for proposing these rules.

```
They're extremely important. Our states need more than guidance. They need regulation so that we don't have more [indiscernible] cases, no more baby girl cases.

They need a force of law.
```

This subject is something that impacts each and every one of us. I have two aunts personally who were taken from our community and raised in the Lower 48, thousands of miles from home, because there were no regulations, no force of law making sure they would stay home.

So we thank you. We don't have any recommendations at this time for changes, but we just wanted to say we support this. Thank you very much.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you.

MS. ROBERTS-HYSLOP: Thank you. My name is

Julie Roberts-Hyslop. R-O-B-E-R-T-S, hyphen,

H-Y-S-L-O-P. I'm a native of Tanana and also currently

the vice president for Tanana Chiefs Conference in

Alaska.

The only recommendation that I would like to make is under 23.104, for you have to provide notice to a tribe. I would like to insert some time frame, like, say, 90 days for the state agency to make a concerted effort to contact the tribes.

So that's the only comment I have. I just

wanted to make sure that's absolutely covered.

MS. DOWNES: Great. Thank you.

1.3

MR. MICKLIN: Good afternoon Miss Bledsoe.

Good to see you. I'm Will Micklin. I'm First Vice

President of Central Council United Tribes of Alaska and
we will be providing written comments.

Many of the recommendations that you heard on the language and on the intent improvements to the proposed rule we'll be providing.

I did want to just mention a few things that are intimately related to this effort to improve ICWA practices, and that's from the point of view of funding. We don't have funding for our tribal courts, and we need our tribal courts in order to process these ICWA cases.

We've had a long pending litigation on their performance under the federal statute and regulations. We won in court and the state is appealing it. We're trying to convince them to drop the appeal, with the election of the new governor and lieutenant governor.

It takes time, but the important point is that we've often had to litigate the state of Alaska's performance in ICWA issues. It's a strain on us in finding the funds and that we really don't have enterprise funds to supplement for these types of

purposes, the government.

You know, we have approximately 30,000 for ICWA in our village communities, about 56,000 for our general community. After rescission and sequester and program reductions, that was a 17 percent reduction in our funding.

So for our six village communities, \$24,440, \$46,000 in Juneau. We have about 7,000 tribal citizens in Juneau alone. So that funding is all we have.

And changes to the rule are important, and they will be helpful in the cases we can process, but that number is so vastly insufficient for protecting our children, our tribal citizens, under the law that it's just very troubling that we're nibbling at the edges, when the huge problem is that we just are not offered funding sufficient to the task at hand.

We have approximately 25 percent of the children in the jurisdictions that we're in, and there's about 60 plus, 60 plus percent are in foster care. So we are disproportionately represented in dysfunctional families and placements.

And many of these placements, speaking from personal experience -- knowing families, I can't, of course, mention names, but I will say that the practices are so similar to those that the Department of Justice

launched the investigation into in -- I think it was the state of South Dakota, that we are intent on asking the Department of Justice to launch a similar investigation into the practices in the state of Alaska.

It's a lack of representation in courts for the custodial parents and the noncustodial parents as well. It's the bullying, particularly the bullying from CPS, from Child Protective Services on the state, many of which seem to have a prejudice against native children in outplacements.

These are horrendous practices that continue, really, without check among the secretary's advisory committee for HHS. We've long implored them to flex their authority in bring the state of Alaska to bear on their plan for the administration of ICWA under statute and regulation.

Their funding stream needs to be sensitive to their performance. Under the law, certainly the tribes are in jeopardy if we went astray from the application of regulations and statutes as far as the states have gone.

We really hope that there's a strong
[indiscernible] relationship with BIA and the Interior,
with the Department of Justice and Health and Human
Services, because each one of them bears a

2.2

responsibility under ICWA and we can't see you operating separately or it being in twos, leading another out.

This is going to take a concerted, collaborative effort. We are certainly willing to participate. We've fought this battle on ICWA on our own funds in the state, but there's such a great need. We need the funds to do what the state won't do or is trying to undo.

And so I much encourage you on the rule, but we need to back it with some action, as well. So thank you for the chance to offer these remarks.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you so much. We definitely hear you and the other commenters on the funding issue and the importance of the collaboration, coordination among the agencies for sure is critical.

MR. SELBY: Good afternoon. I am Ken Selby,
K-E-N, S-E-L-B-Y, Community Service Director for the
Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association of Alaska. We
have 12 tribes that participate in our ICWA program
throughout --

MS. DOWNES: Can you come to the mic a little closer?

MR. SELBY: As we reviewed the proposed rules, we anticipate the new rules will allow the delivery of in-home case management services on tribal reservations,

implementing a new child welfare service approach with high involvement by tribal partners and using a structured decision-making model that focuses on family protection and awareness and assessment, family strengths and needs assessments, and evaluating tribal member progress through [inaudible] in the reassessments.

Now, these are services that we hope to provide on behalf of our tribal [inaudible]. The state involvement has been difficult or not available.

We also look forward to being able to develop a regional foster parent retention and deployment enrollment plan, an in-home preference placement of children -- that's always our priority -- and state governance working more actively with tribal -- enhancing tribal and state collaboration to build sustainable partnerships.

As been has echoed by previous presenters in Alaska, we all, even in the Aleutians -- and my involvement with the program goes back to 1988 -- we recognize the same issues that you heard before throughout the state of Alaska for tribes, many of the tribes, the cooperation by the state to work with us in adopting cases and the lack of funding.

We've heard that there's the increase of

tribal court funding. I'm very hopeful and looking forward to the opportunity for our tribal court in Alaska to have access to those funds.

2.2

And in conclusion, I have a question, or maybe it's a clarification to confirm that does the rules as proposed provide the opportunity for off-reservation tribal member parents to request to have the right for the case to be transferred to an off-reservation tribe, such as in the case of 280 State, which Alaska is, and perhaps specific language should be addressed to the proposal, if need be. Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: Okay. We'll go over here.

MR. MONDRAGON: My name is Antonio Mondragon.

A-N-T-O-N-I-O, M-O-N-D-R-A-G-O-N. I'm from Taos Pueblo,

New Mexico. We have a population of about 2500 tribal

members, and I will say about 13, 1400 of them live on

the reservation right now. Everybody is living

elsewhere out of state and so on.

I'm at the governor's office, and we have one-year terms under the tribal secretary for 2015. And we have a traditional judge. Ours is a traditional court.

Every year ICWA cases are transferred to the tribal courts, and they come to our office to see if tribal courts should accept an ICWA case concerning kids

who are tribal members, or even if they're not tribal members, soon to be enrolled as tribal members.

2.1

In the past I'm not sure what they did, but some of them were not accepted. And in April we kind of did not accept a case, of an ICWA case to be taken by our tribal courts, but I've been talking to the governor to kind of like hold it, just hold on yet, because I feel like we shouldn't be the ones to make that decision. I think it should be the tribal courts, but because of fact that the tribal court is under us, they do what we say.

Because in our governor's office we have the governor, the lieutenant governor, who is a traditional court judge, and then the tribal secretary. We have two sheriffs and then five others who are in charge of our church.

So I'm not really comfortable with us having to make a decision whether or not the tribal courts should accept an ICWA case, so it's been bothering me since April because of the fact that we did not accept one.

However, I kind of just went around back and said hold on a minute, let's wait. And I didn't know that ICWA was going to be presented, but I was kind of doing some research.

Most of our staff members are not knowledgeable in the ICWA case. I know it's huge and I've handled it in the past. So I have more knowledge about the ICWA case. That's the reason why I've still got this gut feeling about what we did, but -- so I just wanted some clarifications on that.

So real quick, in 2007 we had a review of our courts because there was a lot of confusion. People were going to the tribal courts, and if they were not satisfied with their sentencing, they would come to the traditional court.

If they were not satisfied with our decision on whatever they did, then they would go to our War Chief staff. And we have a War Chief staff member here, as well. The War Chief secretary is here too.

So there was a confusion on that, so we had to kind of look into that and set that straight, but the ICWA cases really puts [inaudible] what I wanted to ask you. Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. Thank you for that insight.

MS. BLIZZARD: Good afternoon. Can you hear me? I'm a little short for the mic. My name is Liisia Blizzard and it's spelled L-I-I-S-I-A. My last name is B-L-I-Z-Z-A-R-D. I'm from Kenai, Alaska. I serve on

the tribal council for Kenaitz Indian Tribe, and I want to thank you for your -- this opportunity for us to speak.

1.3

2.2

We say that our children are our greatest resource. We say that they are our future, but during the '60s and '70s and '80s our children -- many of our native children disappeared and most of them have never found their way back.

In the villages in Alaska, there is a word for opposite of children services. It's called nantina [phonetic]. And it is means, literally translated, it's the wind that took the leaves off the trees, and that's what they call [inaudible].

So I would like -- you know, everyone that has spoken has made a lot of, you know, requests, but one of the things that we really need in our area is a tribal representative in every OCS office.

OCS, you know, many families that come to OCS, some of them are confused on their tribal membership.

They belong to a corporation. They don't know if they belong to a tribe, and they're needs to be a greater effort to determine if that child is native.

And I have heard the comment, well, that child didn't look native. Well, that has nothing to do with it. If the parents belong to a tribe, the child is

eligible for tribal membership. And there needs to be a greater effort. So I'm requesting that.

And also, we are desperately in need of foster care funds. We have families that step up to the plate that have lots of children in their homes and they don't have enough income to provide school clothing and school lunches, things like that.

So those, you know, determining eligibility for enrollment is the key thing. That's one key way to prevent our kids from disappearing. So thank you.

That's my comment.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. Over here.

MS. DURAN: Thank you for the opportunity to come before you and provide comment today. Really appreciate it. My name is Shawn Duran. S-H-A-W-N, D-U-R-A-N. I am the tribal administrator for Taos Pueblo.

And the question that I have is in regard to subsection 23.117 on the transfer of jurisdiction to tribal court. Some of the folks that spoke before me mentioned the issue of funding, and as a small tribe, our infrastructure and our tribal court can handle some things and some things it cannot.

So my comment is to look at innovation and flexibility in that, and maybe consideration for smaller

tribes, that they introduce some kind of language for tribes can either network or collaborate with another tribe, another competent court so that there will be options and flexibility in how a court determines whether or not to take jurisdiction of a case.

Thank you.

1.3

MS. DOWNES: Thank you for that.

MS. EDSON: Good afternoon. My name is Greta Edson, Ketchikan Indian Community, Tribal Council.

You know, looking at the proposed regulations and the packet that you had given us, you know, I look and I see all of these pretty -- the information that's the same. It's not any new information. There's new laws. There's new things that are being enacted.

There's things in there that they say that are going to be the best interests of our Indian children. They're talking to us in Alaska about Title IV, which would -- you know, a grant that would enable the tribe to form a tribal court as well as -- oh, my mind went blank on that second one -- oh, foster care. Foster care. So the Title IV. So we have like a three-year grant in order to be able to see if we can implement this.

But one thing that we as a council, as a tribal council looked at, which -- and I'm not talking

1.3

apples and oranges because, in reality, you're looking at a BIA funding. The BIA would be funding this, the ICWA program, as well as the Title IV which they're asking us to participate in.

So to me, the one place that we really -- no one's talked about is the continuity of care for our children. One thing that you as an agency can say, okay, this is what we're going to do and you hand us a packet, and it all looks really good on paper. You know, you're taking the kids away. You're putting them in foster care with Indian families. You're doing all this and all that, and that's looking like it's going to solve a problem.

But in reality, what you're -- what has happened and what is happening is our children are being taken out of homes that are unhealthy. They're not taken out because, you know, their parents are, you know, taking good care of them. That's the sad thing about the issues that we have to face as far as our Indian children are concerned.

So for us as a council, we discussed this and, you know, how are we supposed to make things better for the children. We can do all this stuff. Put them in a foster care home that's got some Indian people in it and then what?

You've got this child who has come from a dysfunctional home, taken out of the family. And even if it is a native family from somewhere else, it's still not home.

1.3

So we're not talking about that next step, that next step with the continuancy [sic] of the care for our children, our continuity of care.

I think that if you're going to be putting this out for us, agencies have to work together. You know, the Title IV(E), the funding, like the lady before us had said, it's pretty nonexistent. You know, for us as a tribe, we're a landless tribe. We don't have casinos or anything else like that to be able to fund these programs.

We looked at how much money it was going to cost us and we talked about it. We really seriously looked at it. But, you know, all the different issues that we would have to take in order to implement this program that, you know, that is on this paper. We don't know if we can afford that stuff. We actually can't, but we have to figure out what parts of it we're going to use, you know.

The apples and oranges of it is the apples and oranges have to be in the same barrel. I think if you're going to be doing this to us, and I'm not -- it's

not in a negative way. I'm not trying to say that.

I'm saying if you're going to hand us a paper on how things are going to be done, we also need to have a Plan B. And you can say, okay, you guys can do all this stuff, but you also, in your packet, in your paper have to say how is this child going to be taken care of after its taken — they're taken out of the family.

That is my concern. My concern is the aftermath of a disturbing disruption of the family and of that child. So I'm asking for, you know, you, whoever you talk to, whoever writes these things when you're at a table somewhere to make the decisions, put a little provision in there about the aftercare of the child after the child's taken away from the family.

It's not addressing in here. I looked. Trust me. I looked in here because I was wanting to see, you know, what was going to happen next. There's no next in here.

So if you guys at the powers that be can do that for our children, I think we'll be able to have a more healthier child. Because those children need to have people to talk to. They need to have counselors. There's all kinds of things that they need to have. Not just taking them out of the house. So I just kind of felt like I had to say that. Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: No, thank you. I mean, that's important. Thank you for the reminder that this is just one step of a much larger theme going on in these children's lives for sure.

1.3

MS. RUNNER: Good afternoon. My name is March Runner. M-A-R-C-H, R-U-N-N-E-R. I'm tribal administrator director for the Galena Village, which is in Galena, Alaska.

I have a 12-page document to send you, but I found more things while sitting is there. One is what is the definition of domicile. The domicile is basically where the child is placed into his permanent placement, and the definition only includes, if the parents are not married, it only includes the mother.

There are instances, like in Alaska, where the parents are not married. The father is from one village and the mother is from another village, and because of the schooling, he or she may be with the mother during the school year and then with the father during the summer for subsistence.

And the way the law is written, if ICWA becomes involved, the father is not considered as a placement. He's just knocked out of the picture. That needs to be changed.

The other thing is the definition of a native

family needs to be strengthened. There's been one instance that I dealt with -- because I work with tribes. I work with ICWA children from Galena that are in the Lower 48, and I work with Washington, Nevada, Texas, other states, with the OCS workers.

And in one of the states a family was considered a native family because the father of the native family had been -- was granted honorary membership to a tribe down here. That classified that home as a preferred ICWA placement. It wasn't. So the definition of native family needs to be strengthened. And that was under -- he qualified under the ICWA preferred preference placement under 23.128.

When you talk about notification to tribes under 23.112, you need to add something that's Alaska specific. If you talk about registered notification, registered notification is two to three days to Anchorage. If you're in Anchorage or Fairbanks, you get it within the time frame. If you live in rural Alaska, there's some places that get mail flights in once a month, and so you don't get the notice in time.

And I've received notices and I've worked with other tribes who received notices where the court case has been going on for two months before they even got the first notice that it was done. So something has to

be done to get notices to tribes in Alaska more efficiently. We lose children like that.

For enrollment under 23.108, the word "or" needs to be taken out of "enrolled or eligible for enrollment." Judges look at that, I can use either enrolled or eligible. And if the child is not enrolled, then I can just ignore eligible and say ICWA doesn't apply. You need -- the "or" needs to come out of it.

Also in 23.135, notice of change, with a changed placement, foster home change, say foster home change or any kind of change in placement, it gives you all the series of why the placements, you know, why notices have to be done, but it doesn't say when. I have received notices two to three months after a change has been done. That's not acceptable.

MS. DOWNES: We've taken of note of those and look forward to your additional comments. Thank you so much.

MR. UKALLAYSAAQ: [speaking Native American language]. Good afternoon. My name is Ukallaysaaq, U-K-A-L-L-A-Y-S-A-A-Q, and I'm the executive director at the Native Village of Kotzebue, and I really appreciate this update. I think it's long overdue, and I want to commend each of you for the work that you've done and the Obama Administration for taking this on.

I think our children kind of have been left behind too much and the interpretation by state, like you said at the beginning in your comments, is really true. The state of Alaska interprets it different ways, but there are different field offices also interpreting it differently.

So a child in the Anchorage area -- and we work with the Fairbanks office, you know, we get treated totally differently. And so it's not only within states. It's within a state.

And, you know, I have a lot of personal experience. I was a foster parent. My wife and I were both foster parents at one time. We're no longer foster parents because of the frustration. And we were foster parenting our own relatives, and some of our relatives got taken from our care and put in a nonnative foster home. You know, it was beyond me of how that ICWA even applied or how that whole process happened, but it happened.

And that wasn't that many years ago, you know, this is 1978. This is 2000. So I really want to emphasize the active efforts that are in there, and I appreciate that some of the active efforts include extended family.

And I've noticed the state of Alaska, when you

look at their foster care manual, they have purposely avoided uses terms in the ICWA act. So they'll call it a relative placement instead of extended family.

They'll use terms that are not in the act so that they avoid compliance. And I didn't realize that until I became more educated in ICWA, and people pointed out what the state of Alaska does. And they even avoid official terms in their manuals to their staff so that they can avoid a lot of — the same word could be used, but they change it. And it's really important I think to see that consistency, you know, throughout. They're doing that on purpose.

The other thing I wanted to mention is we did a workshop this summer in our community -- or this fall in our community on grandparents' rights. We've had a lot of grandparents contact us. They take care of their grandchildren, but they don't have legal custody, and sometimes their custody gets questioned or the parents take them back.

And I don't know how that issue filters into the ICWA law, but I know in our community -- and that's probably pretty true of a lot of other tribal communities -- grandparents get very frustrated because the parents have the rights, and then when they go into the court system, they listen to what the parents say.

2.1

And just like the woman said earlier, they got pulled out of care because there was some serious drinking or drugs or some major neglect going on, and so they listen to the parent, who isn't necessarily done with their treatment, versus listening to the healthy grandparent or a healthy uncle or aunt.

And that's extremely frustrating that our extended family system can be outside of this legal process where the parents' rights trump really what's best for the child, you know, and that's what we're trying to get back to.

So those are my comments and thank you for the work that you're doing, and I look forward to the strength of that going into place.

MS. DOWNES: Great. Thank you. Yes. I think that's an important point. At this point we have sort of talked about the inadvertent noncompliance issues that might be related to a lack of training, but there's oftentimes a failure to comply that is done despite potential action as well. So I thank you for pointing that out to us.

MR. THURMAN: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is George Thurman. I am the Principal Chief of Sac and Fox Nation located in Oklahoma. I can point out there are three Sac and Fox tribes already, from Iowa,

Kansas, and Oklahoma.

2.0

My first question here is Indian child's, in parentheses with quotations, what is an Indian child?

And then in the red letter deal it says,

Indian child's tribe means, one, the Indian tribe in
which the Indian child is a member or is eligible for
membership. We have cases where they're not.

And then number two, the case of an Indian child is a member of or eligible for membership in more than one tribe, the Indian tribe in which the Indian child has more significant contacts. What does that mean, more significant contacts?

I'll give you an example. We have tribal members that want to get on our role and they are blood from one of the other or both of the other tribes, Sac and Fox Tribes. And combined, it's been interpreted possibly that that means combining all blood of all three tribes, you can get on our role if you make the blood quantity.

But if they don't, then they try to go back to one of the other tribes, one of them is only paternal.

You can only get on there if you have a father.

There's instances where there are children out there that can't get on a role. Any role. Does that mean they're not Indian children? So there really needs

to be more definition.

2.0

That's just like ICWA. Indian lands. That is so wide open. This is I feel the same case. Indian child.

Second question, reservation. Reservation

Indian country as defined in 18 U.S.C. 1151, including
any lands title to which is held by United States in

trust for the benefit of any tribe, any Indian tribe or
individual or held by any Indian tribe or individual
subject to a restriction by the United States against
alienation.

We have federal charters where we put lands into trust, and we have titles issued by the county that says held by United States of America in trust for Sac and Fox Nation of Oklahoma. Kevin Washburn, Anna Sledge [phonetic] said we don't recognize your charter. So, see, there's still some loopholes here. I just wanted to point out those two situations. Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you. Richard Jackson from Ketchikan Native community. We're going through a planning development grant right now with the Department of Justice to develop a tribal court in ICWA, so this is really timely that you're going through with this.

I have a concern about page four. On top you

1.3

have in bold print "must ask." I think, to me, that's passive. I would say you must determine whether a child is an Indian child. That puts the burden on these agencies of the state and other agencies to do that.

We have a case in Alaska where the grandmother wanted her grandchild, and the state felt that the child would have a [indiscernible] nonnative. So the burden would be on the agencies or the state if that language could be very strong as opposed to "ask." Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Good afternoon. My name is Frank Thompson, F-R-A-N-K, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-N, First Chief, Evansville Tribal Council in Alaska.

I've got a comment here. We strongly support these regulations, but we also believe that the regulation should explicitly address the Baby Veronica case. The regulations should clarify that Baby Veronica should not be applied outside of the private adoption context and provide guidance on how it should be implemented in practice. This will help avoid further cases like the recent Tanunit case in Alaska. Thank you.

MR. MAYO: Will Mayo, W-I-L-L, M-A-Y-O. I'm a tribal citizen of the native village of Tanana in Alaska and working for the Tanana Chiefs Conference in

Fairbanks.

1.3

And the Alaska Tanunit case was based -- that decision was partially based on the Baby Veronica case and applied in a very weird and very strange manner, but -- so for that reason, we feel it's very important to address how these regs will be implemented to address the Baby Veronica case. So that needs to be very clear because there's ramifications that are affecting us because of it and as evidenced by the Tanunit case.

Also, in December of '14 Congress directed the Department of the Interior, BIA, and along with the Department of Justice to work together to assess the tribal court needs in Public Law 280 states.

And as you've heard from other people who've spoken here, the tribes in Alaska have a very difficult time adequately addressing this. And you may not know that Alaska has a very, very high transient population.

A large part of that is just because of the kinds of jobs that are there, and so a high rate of native children are adopted by transient nonnative families. Shortly after that, they leave the state for good, and so, as you know, that is devastating to families and to the identities, as these children grow up, to finding their identity.

So many stories that we have of people trying

1 to find their tribal affiliation and coming back to 2 Alaska from all over the nation in their adulthood. 3 Some of them successful but some not. 4 So at any rate, the directive to the 5 Department of the Interior and Department of Justice was to give a report in 180 days, which would place it 6 7 around the middle of next month. 8 And so I would just strongly urge the BIA to 9 develop that cost analysis for tribes in Alaska to 10 receive some just help, because we do not -- we cannot 11 access the help in any other way that is required. 12 just wanted to make those comments and urge the 13 department to please take seriously the report language 14 directing that by Congress. Thank you. 15 MS. DOWNES: Thank you. And my last update 16 was, or understanding, that that report will be 17 completed by the deadline. So we're on track to meet 18 that target, so --19 MR. MAYO: All right. Thank you very much. 2.0 Thank you. Do we have other MS. DOWNES: 21 comments? We have the room for another half hour or so. 22 I'd like to ask if Rodina, Sarah, or Gina have anything 23 they would like to share at this point that we might 24 request official clarification or questions on or

comments on or anything that would be helpful?

25

2.1

MS. CAVE: Hi. Rodina Cave again. We had a comment earlier regarding the agencies working together, Department of the Interior, Department of Justice, and HHS, and I just wanted to point out that those three agencies are working together.

I don't know if folks here are aware that the Attorney General's Advisory Committee on American Indian and Alaska native children exposed to violence, they delivered their report and recommendations in November of 2014.

And there's a lot to that report. There's a lot in there. There are a lot of recommendations, and many of the recommendations are regarding the collaboration between the agencies, specifically on ICWA compliance.

And, you know, we want folks to know that the agencies have already started meeting and will continue meeting. We had a summit, ICWA summit, and we are sharing information and sharing ideas about how to move forward on that.

And at the ICWA conference last week -- was it last week? -- the three agencies met at a federal listening session, DOJ, HHS, and Interior, to hear comments specifically on suggestions for ICWA compliance and suggestions from people regarding what is working.

What is working with your tribes and states. What are the collaborations that are working. Where are the strengths. Where should resources be directed.

1.3

And one of the things that DOJ shared at that listening session was specifically they wanted to reach out with some comments or with specific suggestions for the Department of Justice, they have an email address, ICWA@DOJ.gov.

So I just wanted to share that and to let folks know that there has been -- we have a unique opportunity at this point, in light of the, you know, the Attorney General's Advisory Committee report, and I'm sure that Ann Marie can also give more information about the President's Gen I initiative, that there are unique opportunities here for collaboration and for work on Indian child welfare issues. Thank you.

MS. DOWNES: Anybody else from the panel?

Other comments? So I will go ahead and close out the session a few minutes early. It's about 3:47.

I'd like to thank everybody who participated, both as commenters today and the staff in the room, and the court reporter, who was instrumental in getting this session on the books, so quickly. So thank you all for attending.

If you did not, and for those of you who are

```
still here, if you didn't sign up, please do so in the
 1
 2
    back. And you can look for the transcript to be and the
 3
    comments to be posted within a couple, three weeks of
 4
    today's session.
 5
               So, and if you think of anything else, please
 6
    email your comments to Comments@BIA.gov. Thank you all.
 7
                  (Session concluded 3:47 p.m.)
                               -000-
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
STATE OF NEVADA
 1
                             SS.
    COUNTY OF WASHOE
 2
               I, KRISTINE BOKELMANN, a Certified Court
 3
 4
    Reporter in and for the County of Washoe, State of
 5
    Nevada, do hereby certify:
              That the foregoing hearing was taken down, as
 6
 7
    stated in the caption, and the colloquies were reduced
    to typewriting under my direction; that the transcript
 8
    is a true and correct record of the proceedings.
 9
10
               I further certify that I am not a relative or
11
    employee or attorney of any party, nor am I financially
    interested in the outcome of the action.
12
13
                       This, the 7th day of May, 2015.
              DATED:
14
                         // Kristine A. Bokelmann //
15
                    KRISTINE A. BOKELMANN, CCR #165
16
17
18
19
2.0
2.1
22
23
24
25
```